

In light of the above, the Applicant maintains that claim 11 is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests such disposition. Claim 12 depends from dependent claim 11 and inherits all of the novel and nonobvious features of the dependent claim. However, claim 12 adds additional features that further distinguish from Emery and Lawson, either alone or in combination. For example, claim 12 recites language similar to that recited in claim 3 for which the Applicant has already argued in favor of patentability. Accordingly, the Applicant's arguments of claim 3 apply herein as well.

Claim 39 recites language similar to that of claim 11 but in a method claim format. The arguments that applied to claim 11, apply herein as well with all differences being considered. Additionally, claim 40 recites language similar to that recited in claim 3. Again, the Applicant's arguments of claim 3 apply herein as well.

CONCLUSION

Based upon the foregoing, the Applicant believes that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and such disposition is respectfully requested. In the event that the Applicant's arguments are deemed not persuasive, the Applicant respectfully requests a prompt reply so that the Applicant will have sufficient time to frame the application for appeal. In the event that a telephone conversation would further prosecution and/or expedite allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSH FISCHMANN & BREYFOGLE LLP

By:

Gregory T. Fettig
Registration No. 50,843
3151 South Vaughn Way, Suite 411
Aurora, Colorado 80014
(303) 338-0997

Date: Aug. 9, 2005